

REMARKS

The applicant has carefully reviewed the application in light of the final Office Action dated January 26, 2007. Applicant amends claims 1, 4, 6, and 7. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added by these amendments. The amendments to the claims have only been done to expedite the prosecution.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejects Claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 7 recites the limitation “the target component” in lines 9 and 13-14. Applicant has amended claim 7 to correct a typological error. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,895,586 issued to Brasher (hereinafter “*Brasher*”). Applicant submits that *Brasher* fails to teach each and every limitation of the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the comments set forth below.

For example, claim 1 recites, “a first computer executing a first application in that objects represent corresponding components, wherein the first application relates the objects in both a hierarchy identifying types of components and a different hierarchy identifying information associated with objects.” In particular, the first application relates objects in both a type hierarchy and an object hierarchy. In contrast, *Brasher* merely teaches a single hierarchal namespace that is implemented over multiple computers such as in an enterprise network. Col. 4, lines 4-7. Using this single hierarchal namespace, common attributes and attribute types for objects are defined for all computers in the system. Col. 15, lines 61-66. Therefore, *Brasher* fails

to teach or suggest a type hierarchy and a different object hierarchy. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 and its dependents.

Independent claims 4, 6 and 7 recite limitations that are similar, although not identical, to the limitation of claim 1 discussed above. Therefore, these claims and their respective dependents are allowable for reasons analogous to those discussed above in connection with claim 1.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejects claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brasher* as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,731,735 issued to Borgendale (hereinafter “*Borgendale*”). The Examiner also rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brasher* as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Tanenbaum (Tanenbaum, Andrew S. “Computer Networks.” Third Edition, Prentice Hall PTR, 1996; pages 630-643.) (hereafter “*Tanenbaum*”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the comments set forth below. In particular, these depend from one of independent claims 1 and 4. As discussed above, independent Claims 1 and 6 are allowable over *Brasher*. The Office Action fails to cite any teaching or suggestion in *Borgendale* and *Tanenbaum* of the missing elements discussed above. Therefore, claims 2 and 5 are allowable at least because they depend from one of allowable claims 1 and 6. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all Claims.

If the present application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained, Applicants hereby request a telephone conference with the Examiner and further request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule the telephone conference.

Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.136, applicant hereby petitions that the period for response to the action dated January 26, 2007, be extended for one month to and including **May 26, 2007**.

The Extension of Time fee in the amount of **\$120** is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

The RCE fee in the amount of **\$790** is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

No other fees are believed due. However, please apply any deficiencies or any other required fees or any credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing the attorney docket number shown above.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 25, 2007

/Michael E. Cox/

Michael E. Cox
Reg. No. 47,505

Customer No.: **32864**
Fish & Richardson P.C.

Direct Phone: (214) 760-6107
Fax: (214) 747-2091